

On the continuous-time limit of the Barabási-Albert random graph

Angelica Pachon*, Federico Polito* & Laura Sacerdote*

*Mathematics Department “G. Peano”, University of Torino, Italy

July 15, 2016

Abstract

We prove that the Barabási–Albert model converges weakly to a set of generalized Yule models via an appropriate scaling. To pursue this aim we superimpose to its graph structure a suitable set of processes that we call the *planted model* and we introduce an ad-hoc sampling procedure. The use of the obtained limit process represents an alternative and advantageous way of looking at some of the asymptotic properties of the Barabási–Albert random graph.

Keywords: Barabási–Albert model; Random graphs; Preferential attachment; Planted model; Discrete- and continuous-time models; Yule model.

MSC2010: 05C80, 90B15, 60J80.

1 Introduction

One of the most popular models for network growth is the preferential attachment model proposed by Barabási and Albert [1] to describe the web graph growth. In this model a newly created vertex is connected to one of those already present in the network with a probability proportional to their degrees. An important feature characterizing the preferential attachment growth mechanism is the presence of a power-law distribution for the asymptotic degree of a vertex selected uniformly at random. This property is observed on World Wide Web data [1, 14, 19]. Furthermore, power-law distributions occur frequently in real-world phenomena and many of them are strictly related to the preferential attachment paradigm [5, 8, 9, 18, 21]. This fact determines an increasing interest for the Barabási–Albert model (BA model) and for random graphs growing with the preferential attachment rule in general.

The study of this model as well as that of its generalizations is based on combinatorial arguments [4], the implementation of stochastic approximation methods (see e.g. [6, 11]), master equation methods [7, 10, 12] and the use of continuous-time limits (see e.g. [24]). The latter approach looks very fruitful but often used avoiding a rigorous mathematical approach. In this context the random graph framework — on which we rely on this article — is a powerful tool for a mathematically coherent study.

Different well-known models related to random graphs such as the Yule model for macroevolution [26] and the Simon model describing the appearance of new words in the writing of texts [25] are often identified because of their similar asymptotic power-law distributions. Despite the presence of articles concerning mathematical derivations of properties of different random graphs (for the BA model see e.g. [3, 4, 22]), rigorous mathematical results connecting discrete-time preferential attachment models to continuous-time models such as the Yule model are still almost missing in the literature. In order to partially close this gap we recently proved that asymptotically the Simon model is related to the Yule model in a non trivial sense [23]. The analytical study of continuous-time models results easier and the possibility to switch from discrete- to continuous-time is an important tool for the study of asymptotic properties of graph models.

In this paper we study the BA model and relate it to a specific continuous-time stochastic model which generalizes the Yule model. Indeed the main result of this paper states that

the BA model with parameter $m \geq 1$ converges in the sense of weak convergence to a set of m -Yule models, via appropriate scaling. To prove the result we make use of some of the ideas in [23] and a coupling argument.

The techniques used in the paper belong to the graph limits approach describing how models characterized by preferential attachment mechanisms can be embedded in continuous-time processes. This type of techniques have emerged in the recent past and have increasingly gained ground (see e.g. [2]).

The paper is organized as follows. The BA, the Yule and the m -Yule models are described in Section 2. In Section 3 an alternative method for the sampling procedure of a random vertex in a general random graph model is proposed together with the notion of *planted model*, i.e. a structure we superimpose on the random graph. This method is a key tool to prove our main results. More specifically this procedure is used to prove the relation between a random vertex chosen uniformly at random in the BA model and an individual chosen uniformly at random from one of the m -Yule models, also chosen uniformly at random from the set of all m -Yule models in the planted model. In Section 4 the main results are presented and in Section 5 they are proved. Summarizing them briefly, Theorem 4.1 shows that when infinitely many vertices have already appeared in the BA model, the degree distribution of a vertex appearing subsequently coincides with the distribution of the number of individuals in a Yule process starting with m initial individuals. Theorem 4.2 proves the convergence to the same limit distribution of the degree of a vertex chosen uniformly at random in the BA model (when the number of vertices diverges) and the size of a genus chosen uniformly at random in an m -Yule model when time goes to infinity. Moreover, we also prove that in the BA model the proportion of vertices with a given degree k converges in probability (as the number of vertices diverges) to the probability that the degree of a vertex chosen uniformly at random is equal to k . Finally, the exact form of the limit distribution of Theorem 4.1 is given in Proposition 4.1.

2 The two models of interest

2.1 The Barabási-Albert (BA) model

In [1] the preferential attachment paradigm was proposed for the first time to model the growth of the World Wide Web. For this aim the authors proposed a random graph model in which the vertices were added to the graph one at a time and joined to a fixed number of existing vertices, selected with probability proportional to their degree. In such a model the vertices represented the web pages and the edges their links. In [1] the model is described as follows:

Starting with a small number (m_0) of vertices, at every time step add a new vertex with m ($\leq m_0$) edges that link the new vertex to m different vertices already present in the system. To incorporate preferential attachment, assume that the probability that a new vertex will be connected to a vertex i depends on the connectivity k_i of that vertex, so it would be equal to $k_i / \sum_j k_j$. Thus, after t steps the model leads to a random network with $t + m_0$ vertices and mt edges.

The previous model was then defined in rigorous mathematical terms by Bollobás et al. [4]. Here we recall their definition for the growth of the random graph process $(G^t)_{t \in \mathcal{T}}$.

Definition 2.1. *For each $m \geq 1$ and for every $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+ \cup \{0\}$, the process $(G_m^t)_{t \geq 1}$ is such that,*

1. *at time $t = n(m + 1) + 1$ a new vertex v_{n+1} is added;*
2. *for $i = 2, \dots, m + 1$, at each time $t = n(m + 1) + i$ an edge from v_{n+1} to v is added with v chosen according to*

$$\mathbb{P}(v_{n+1} \longrightarrow v) = \begin{cases} \frac{d(v, t-1)}{2(mn + i - 1) - 1}, & v \neq v_{n+1}, \\ \frac{d(v, t-1) + 1}{2(mn + i - 1) - 1}, & v = v_{n+1}. \end{cases} \quad (2.1)$$

We explicitly underline that here $(G_m^t)_{t \geq 1}$ starts at time $t = 1$ with a single vertex, v_1 , without loops. However, since at time $t = 2$ the only existing vertex is v_1 , then a loop is produced.

2.2 The Yule model

In the previous section we presented a model of random graph growth in discrete time. Here we introduce a continuous-time model. To avoid misunderstandings, we denote here with $T \in \mathbb{R}^+ \cup \{0\}$ the continuous-time variable, while $t \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ indicates the discrete time.

The model of interest here is the classical model introduced in the twenties by Yule [26]. It was proposed to describe the macroevolution of a population characterized by different genera and species belonging to them.

In order to describe the Yule model we first recall the well-know definition of a Yule process, that is a linear birth process in continuous-time. A Yule model will then be defined in terms of a collection of independent Yule processes of different birth intensities.

Definition 2.2. *A Yule process $N(T)_{T \geq 0}$ is a counting process in continuous-time, with the initial condition that $N(0) = g$, $g \geq 1$, almost surely. It is characterized by the infinitesimal transition probabilities*

$$\mathbb{P}(N(T+h) = k + \ell \mid N(T) = k) = \begin{cases} k\lambda h + o(h), & \ell = 1, \\ o(h), & \ell > 1, \\ 1 - k\lambda h + o(h), & \ell = 0, \end{cases} \quad (2.2)$$

where $\lambda > 0$, is the birth intensity and $h > 0$.

This process describes the growth of a population in which, during any short time interval of length h each member has probability $\lambda h + o(h)$, independently one another, to create a new individual. Note that the probability of simultaneous births is $o(h)$. Yule [26] proposed to use this process to model the growth of the number of species belonging to the same genus in an evolving population. Furthermore, a second Yule process, characterized by a different birth intensity β and independent of the former, was used for the growth of the number of genera. The stochastic process determined by the combination of these two types of Yule processes is now known as a Yule model and can be defined as follows.

Definition 2.3. *A Yule model describes the growth of a population according to the following rules:*

1. *genera (each comprising a single species) appear as a Yule process $\{N_\beta(T)\}_{T \geq 0}$ of parameter β with one genus at time $T = 0$ almost surely;*
2. *each time a new genus appears, a copy of a Yule process of parameter λ with a single initial individual starts. Those copies are independent one another and from the process of appearance of genera. Each copy models the evolution of the species belonging to the same genus.*

In this paper we also consider an m -Yule model (denoted by $\{Y_{\lambda,\beta}^m(T)\}_{T \geq 0}$), that is a process similar to a classical Yule model but in which the birth processes describing the evolution of the species belonging to each genus start from $m \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ initial species almost surely. To underline the initial condition we will add a superscript m to the Yule process counting the number of species for each genus (N_λ^m). We explicitly remark that the letter m , used for the initial value of the m -Yule model was already used to indicate the number of edges from a vertex in the BA model. This choice is not a coincidence, in the next paragraphs we will in fact prove that the initial value of the limiting N_λ^m is determined by the parameter m of the BA model. Finally, we underline that the 1-Yule model coincides with the original Yule model in [26].

3 Sampling a random vertex: a result

To prove the weak convergence of the Simon model to the Yule model, in [23] we introduced a specific procedure of sampling vertices from the random graph related to the Simon model. Moreover we showed that this procedure is equivalent to a uniform sampling. Here we propose

n		$b(v_1, \mathfrak{T}_n)$		$b(v_2, \mathfrak{T}_n)$	$\dots$		$b(v_i, \mathfrak{T}_n)$
i	v_1	1	v_2	1		v_i	1
$i+1$		1	v_{i+1}	2			1
$i+2$		1		2	$\dots$	v_{i+2}	2
$i+3$	v_{i+3}	2		2			2
$i+4$		2	v_{i+4}	3			2
$\dots$	$\dots$	$\dots$	$\dots$	$\dots$	$\dots$	$\dots$	$\dots$

Table 1: (First line): The construction starts with i discrete-time birth processes at time $\mathfrak{T}_i$, each one with one individual. (Second line): At time $\mathfrak{T}_{i+1}$ a new vertex v_{i+1} appears. The vertex v_{i+1} is assigned as a child to one of the existing vertices $\{v_1, v_2, \dots, v_i\}$ with probability $1/i$. In this table the appearing vertex becomes a child of v_2 . (Next lines): At times $\mathfrak{T}_{n+1}$, $n \geq i$, the vertex v_{n+1} appears and it is assigned to one of the existing vertices with probability $1/n$. Observe that in this example $b(v_2, \mathfrak{T}_{i+4}) = 3$. Given this information, $\mathbb{P}[b(v_2, \mathfrak{T}_{i+5}) = 4] = 3/(i+4)$.

an alternative method for the the uniform sampling procedure of a random vertex from a graph. For a greater generality we consider a sequence $\{M_n\}_{n \geq 1}$ of random variables taking values in $\mathbb{Z}^+$ a.s. and a graph in which M_n edges start from the vertex appeared at time n , $n \geq 1$. Then we apply this procedure to sample a random vertex in the special case of the BA model, i.e. in the case $M_n = m$ almost surely.

In order to describe the sampling procedure, we introduce first a model that we call the *planted model* for the random graph $(\mathcal{G}_i)_{i \geq 1}$. The idea underlying the planted model is to superimpose a tree structure on the graph.

We start by remarking that, at each time of the form $\mathfrak{T}_i = \sum_{r=1}^i (M_r + 1)$, the graph $\mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{T}_i}$ has exactly i vertices, $i \in \mathbb{Z}^+$. Fix an $i > 1$. To get the tree structure at the following times $\mathfrak{T}_{n+1}$, $n \geq i$, we attribute to v_{n+1} the role of child of a vertex chosen uniformly at random from the set of the existing vertices $\{v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n\}$. This procedure determines chains of successive offsprings of each of the planted vertices $\{v_1, v_2, \dots, v_i\}$. We call a vertex v appeared after v_j $j = 1, \dots, i$, a descendant of v_j if both v and v_j belong to the same lineage. In this way we construct i birth processes in discrete time, $\{b(v_j, \mathfrak{T}_n)\}_{n \geq i}$, $j = 1, \dots, i$. Here $b(v_j, \mathfrak{T}_n)$, $j = 1, \dots, i$, $n \geq i$, is the total number of descendants of v_j at time $\mathfrak{T}_n$. Note that we have:

- $b(v_j, \mathfrak{T}_i) = 1$, $j = 1, \dots, i$;
- $\mathbb{P}[b(v_j, \mathfrak{T}_{n+1}) = k + 1 \mid b(v_j, \mathfrak{T}_n) = k] = k/n$, $k \geq 1$, $n \geq i$, $j = 1, \dots, i$.

The second point above is because at time $\mathfrak{T}_{n+1}$, $n \geq i$, each existing vertex in the set $\{v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n\}$ may give birth to a new one with probability $1/n$.

Note that the i discrete-time birth processes are dependent but identically distributed. Furthermore the BA random graph model corresponds to the case $M_n = m$ a.s., $n \geq 1$, so that $\mathfrak{T}_n = n(m+1)$ almost surely.

Table 1 shows an example of the construction of the planted model.

3.1 Sampling from the planted model

Various procedures can be used to select a vertex uniformly at random from $\mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{T}_n}$, $n \geq i$. Here we propose a procedure that will be useful to prove our results. To this aim let us first rename the vertices $\{v_1, \dots, v_n\}$ as $\{v_{j,\ell}\}$, where $v_{j,\ell}$ denotes the ℓ -th vertex from the j -th birth process. Now consider the following experiment.

1. Choose one of the i discrete-time birth processes with probability proportional to its number of vertices.
2. Choose a vertex uniformly at random among those belonging to the selected birth process.

Our focus will be on the selected vertex $v_{j,\ell}$, $j = 1, \dots, i$, $\ell = 1, \dots, b(v_j, \mathfrak{T}_n)$ and on the selected birth process.

Theorem 3.1. *The previous experiment induces*

1. *the uniform distribution for selecting a vertex on the set of vertices of $\mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{T}_n}$;*

2. the uniform distribution for choosing a birth process on the set of the i birth processes belonging to the planted model.

Proof. For the sake of simplicity let us rename the random variable $b(v_j, \mathfrak{T}_n)$ by Y and note that it takes values in $\{1, 2, \dots, n - i + 1\}$, $n \geq i$. Let W and Z denote the indices of a birth process and a vertex from that birth process, respectively. Then, the probability of selecting the vertex $v_{j,\ell}$ is given by

$$\mathbb{P}(W = j, Z = \ell) = \sum_{k=1}^{n-i+1} \mathbb{P}(Z = \ell \mid W = j, Y = k) \mathbb{P}(W = j \mid Y = k) \mathbb{P}(Y = k) = \frac{1}{n}, \quad (3.1)$$

where the last equality is obtained by observing that $\mathbb{P}(Z = \ell \mid W = j, Y = k) = 1/k$ and $\mathbb{P}(W = j \mid Y = k) = k/n$. Hence, the distribution on the set of vertices in $\mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{T}_n}$ is uniform.

To prove the second part of the theorem let us consider the marginal probability of choosing one of the i birth process:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(W = j) &= \sum_{k=1}^{n-i+1} \mathbb{P}(W = j \mid Y = k) \mathbb{P}(Y = k) \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^{n-i+1} \frac{k}{n} \mathbb{P}(Y = k) = \frac{\mathbb{E}(Y)}{n} = \frac{1}{i}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.2)$$

where the last equality follows by applying a result for a Pólya urn model. In the considered scheme a single urn initially contains $i - 1$ white and one black ball. At each time step a ball is drawn from the urn and then replaced together with one ball of the same color. Let X be the number of black balls in $n - i$ drawings in a Pólya urn. The relationship between X and the number of individuals in one of the i birth process of the planted model is $Y = X + 1$. The distribution of X is well known (see e.g. [17], Section 4.2) and its expectation is $\mathbb{E}[X] = (n - i)/i$, so that $\mathbb{E}[Y] = n/i$. Hence the measure induced by choosing a birth process in the mechanism of sampling a vertex from the planted model, is uniform on the i discrete-time birth processes. $\square$

4 Main Results

Let us consider the random graph process $(G_m^t)_{t \geq 1}$ defining the BA model, characterized by vertices with degree $d(v_i, t)$, $i \geq 1$, at time t . Consider the collection of random graphs $\mathfrak{G}_m^n = G_m^{t_n}$ sampled at the times $t_n = n(m + 1)$, $n \geq 1$, to define the random graph process $(\mathfrak{G}_m^n)_{n \geq 1}$. We explicitly remark that $\mathfrak{G}_m^n$ comprises exactly n vertices. Denote by $D(v_i, n)$ the degree of an existing vertex v_i in $(\mathfrak{G}_m^n)_{n \geq 1}$ and observe that $d(v_i, n(m + 1)) = D(v_i, n)$.

Let us recall that an m -Yule model is characterized by two distinct growth mechanisms. The first deals with the appearance of new genera and it is modelled by a Yule process of parameter β and starting with one progenitor. The second describes the development of species belonging to each specific genus and it is modelled by a Yule process of parameter λ starting with m initial individuals. Note that the latter characterizes the reproduction mechanism of the species belonging to each genus independently of the others.

With the aim of relating the BA model to an m -Yule model we switch from the language of genera and species to that of random graphs with vertices and edges. By using the results of Section 3 we interpret the BA model identifying two different processes (in discrete time), one for the appearance of directed edges of a fixed vertex and the other for the creation of new vertices, such that, by appropriate scaling these two processes converge to the two Yule processes which conditionally define an m -Yule model.

Heuristically, we identify the two converging processes in the BA model as follows. For the first process note that in the BA model, m directed edges connect each new vertex to the others with probabilities proportional to the degrees of the existing vertices. Thus, at the time when there are n vertices, we have mn directed edges, and by the preferential attachment rule,

$$\mathbb{P}[D(v, n + 1) = k + 1 \mid D(v, n) = k] \approx \frac{km}{2mn} = \frac{k}{2n}. \quad (4.1)$$

The approximation consists in connecting all the m edges simultaneously.

To identify the second process we consider the time interval between the instants at which the degree of v changes from k to $k + 1$. Neglecting the increasing of the number of vertices, the distribution of this random time interval is Geometric with parameter $k/(2n)$. In this approximations, when $n \rightarrow \infty$ we obtain a convergence to an Exponential random variable of parameter $k\lambda$, with $\lambda = 1/2$. Furthermore, neglecting the possibility of loops, the initial degree of v_i , $i \geq n$, turns out to be equal to m . These two observations suggest that the growth process of the degree of a vertex in the BA model can be approximated by a Yule process with parameter $\lambda = 1/2$ and initial condition $N_\lambda(0) = m$ almost surely. In Theorem 4.1 we prove this convergence substituting the above approximations with rigorous convergence results.

To prove Theorem 4.1 we start by showing that the transition probabilities of the degree process of a vertex in the BA model are bounded (Lemma 5.1). Then, by using these bounds we construct two Markovian processes coupled with the degree process (Lemma 5.2 and Corollary 5.1). Finally, we use this coupling to show that the finite-dimensional distribution of the degree of a vertex in the BA model, converges to the finite-dimensional distribution of a Yule process with initial population size equal to m (Lemma 5.3).

In order to relate the deterministic appearance of new vertices in the BA model with a continuous-time Yule process, we make use of the planted model described in Section 3 observing the vertices in one of the i birth processes. Since the probability of choosing a birth process in the mechanism of sampling a vertex from the planted model is uniform on the i processes (see Theorem 3.1), we can choose any of them. In Lemma 5.4 we prove that each birth process in the planted model, that is $\{b(v_j, n(m+1))\}_{n \geq i, 1 \leq j \leq i}$, converges in distribution as $i \rightarrow \infty$, to a Yule process of parameter $\beta = 1$ with one initial progenitor.

Finally, in Theorem 4.2 we show that the BA model is related to a sequence of i different m -Yule models via appropriate scalings. Exploiting this relation we prove that the asymptotic degree distribution of a vertex chosen uniformly at random in the BA model coincides with the asymptotic distribution of the size of a genus chosen uniformly at random from one of the m -Yule models selected also uniformly at random.

Theorem 4.1. *For every $i \in \mathbb{N}$, $w_1 < w_2 < \dots < w_b \in \mathbb{R}^+$, let $x_1 = \lfloor (i-1)w_1 \rfloor, \dots, x_b = \lfloor (i-1)w_b \rfloor, y_1 = \lfloor iw_1 \rfloor, \dots, y_b = \lfloor iw_b \rfloor$. There exists a non-decreasing sequence $z_1, \dots, z_b \in \mathbb{N}$ of stopping times satisfying $x_1 < z_1 \leq y_1, \dots, x_b < z_b \leq y_b$ a.s, for which*

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}[D(v_j, j + z_1 = k_1), \dots, D(v_j, j + z_b) = k_b] \\ = \mathbb{P}[N_{1/2}^m(\ln(1 + w_1)) = k_1, \dots, N_{1/2}^m(\ln(1 + w_b)) = k_b] \\ = \prod_{\ell=1}^b \binom{k_\ell - 1}{k_\ell - k_{\ell-1}} e^{-\frac{k_\ell - 1}{2} \ln\left(\frac{1+w_\ell}{1+w_{\ell-1}}\right)} \left(1 - e^{-\frac{1}{2} \ln\left(\frac{1+w_\ell}{1+w_{\ell-1}}\right)}\right)^{k_\ell - k_{\ell-1}}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.2)$$

Here $w_0 = 0$, $k_0 = m$, and $m \leq k_1 \leq \dots \leq k_b$.

Hence, the degree of v_j , $j \geq i$, at times $z_1, \dots, z_b$, after its first appearance in $(\mathfrak{G}_m^n)_{n \geq 1}$, converges as $i \rightarrow \infty$ to the same joint distribution as the number of individuals of a Yule process with m initial individuals and parameter $\lambda = 1/2$.

Theorem 4.2. *Consider an m -Yule model $\{Y_{1/2,1}^m(T)\}_{T \geq 0}$, and let $\mathcal{N}_T^m$ be the size of a genus chosen uniformly at time T in $\{Y_{1/2,1}^m(T)\}_{T \geq 0}$. Consider the random graph process $(G_m^t)_{t \geq 1}$ defining the BA model with $N_{k,t}$ vertices with degree k . Let $d(V_t)$ indicate the degree of a vertex chosen uniformly at random at time t in (G_m^t) . Then for $t = n(m+1)$ we have*

$$p_k := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(d(V_t) = k) = \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{N}_T^m = k) \quad (4.3)$$

and

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\left|\frac{N_{k,t}}{n} - \mathbb{P}(d(V_t) = k)\right| \geq \frac{\sqrt{(m+1) \ln(n(m+1))}}{\sqrt{n}}\right) \leq (n(m+1))^{-1/8}. \quad (4.4)$$

Furthermore as $n \rightarrow \infty$, $\frac{N_{k,t}}{n} \rightarrow p_k$ in probability.

Using the previous theorem and directly exploiting the properties of the m -Yule model we are able to recover the well known result for the asymptotic degree distribution of the BA random graph.

Proposition 4.1. Consider an m -Yule model $\{Y_{1/2,1}^m(T)\}_{T \geq 0}$ and the size N_T^m of a genus chosen uniformly at random at time T from it as in Theorem 4.2. Then,

$$p_k = m(m+1)B(k, 3), \quad (4.5)$$

where $k \geq m$ and $B(a, b)$ is the Beta function.

Remark 4.1. Notice that the distribution (4.5) clearly coincides with the degree distribution of the BA model [4].

5 Proofs

5.1 Auxiliary Lemmas and the Proof of Theorem 4.1

In order to prove Theorem 4.1, within the construction of the BA model, we identify two different processes in discrete time, one for the appearing of in-links of each specific vertex and the other related to the creation of new vertices. Then, we prove that these two processes converge to the two birth processes which are at the basis of the definition of an m -Yule model. Before starting the construction of the process for the appearance of in-links of a fixed vertex we introduce the following definition.

Definition 5.1. We say that a vertex v_i appears “complete” when it has appeared in the BA random graph process together with all the directed edges originated from it.

Note that the degree of a complete vertex is at least m , and at time $t = n(m+1)$, the BA model has for the first time exactly n complete vertices.

Next we determine how the degree of a fixed vertex changes during the time until a new complete vertex appears.

Lemma 5.1. Let $(G_m^t)_{t \geq 1}$ be the random graph process defining the BA model and let $d(v_i, t)$ denote the degree of an existing vertex v_i at time t , $i \leq n$. Given that $d(v_i, n(m+1)) = k$, $k \geq m$, then there exist four constants $b_2 > b_1 > 0$ and $c_1, c_2 > 0$ such that

$$\frac{k}{2(n+1)} + \frac{c_2}{n^2} < \mathbb{P}[d(v_i, (n+1)(m+1)) = k+1 \mid d(v_i, n(m+1)) = k] < \frac{k}{2n} + \frac{c_1}{n^2}, \quad (5.1)$$

and

$$\frac{b_2}{n^2} < \mathbb{P}[d(v_i, (n+1)(m+1)) = k+\ell \mid d(v_i, n(m+1)) = k] < \frac{b_1}{n^2}, \quad 1 < \ell \leq m. \quad (5.2)$$

Furthermore,

$$\mathbb{P}[d(v_{n+1}, (n+1)(m+1)) = m] = 1 - O(1/n). \quad (5.3)$$

Proof. Our aim is to determine the changes of degree of a fixed vertex during the time interval $(n(m+1), (n+1)(m+1)]$, i.e., during the time interval necessary to switch from n to $(n+1)$ complete vertices. Let us fix $t = n(m+1)$ and follow the graph growth during the considered interval. At time $n(m+1) + 1$ a new vertex v_{n+1} (without edges) appears. Then from time $n(m+1) + 2$ to time $(n+1)(m+1)$ a directed edge from v_{n+1} to an existing vertex v_i , $i \leq n+1$, is added. The vertex v_i is chosen with probability given by (2.1). Let $Y_{v_i}^n$ be the total number of incoming edges to v_i , $i \leq n$, added to v_i during the time interval $(n(m+1), (n+1)(m+1)]$. Note that $\mathbb{P}[d(v_i, (n+1)(m+1)) = k+\ell \mid d(v_i, n(m+1)) = k] = \mathbb{P}[Y_{v_i}^n = \ell \mid d(v_i, n(m+1)) = k]$, $\ell = 0, \dots, m$. To estimate the latter conditional probabilities we distinguish the cases $Y_{v_i}^n = 0$, $Y_{v_i}^n = 1$, and $Y_{v_i}^n \geq 2$.

In the first case, considering the probabilities (2.1) we have

$$\mathbb{P}[Y_{v_i}^n = 0 \mid d(v_i, n(m+1)) = k] = \prod_{\ell=2}^{m+1} \left(1 - \frac{k}{2(mn + \ell - 1) - 1}\right). \quad (5.4)$$

Since $\prod_{\ell=2}^{m+1} \left(1 - \frac{k}{2(mn + \ell - 1) - 1}\right) \leq \left(1 - \frac{k}{2(mn + m) - 1}\right)^m$, we get the upper bound for (5.4),

$$\left(1 - \frac{k}{2(mn + m) - 1}\right)^m = 1 - \frac{mk}{2m(n+1) - 1} + O\left(\frac{1}{n^2}\right). \quad (5.5)$$

Furthermore, since $\prod_{\ell=2}^{m+1} \left(1 - \frac{k}{2(mn+\ell-1)-1}\right) \geq \left(1 - \frac{k}{2(mn+1)-1}\right)^m$, we get the lower bound

$$\left(1 - \frac{k}{2(mn+1)-1}\right)^m = 1 - \frac{mk}{2mn+1} + O\left(\frac{1}{n^2}\right). \quad (5.6)$$

As far as the third case is concerned we observe that if $m = 1$ then $\mathbb{P}(Y_{v_i}^n \geq 2 \mid d(v_i, n(m+1)) = k) = 0$. Thus we calculate such probability just for the case $m > 1$. Furthermore, since we do not need a closed form of $\mathbb{P}(Y_{v_i}^n \geq 2 \mid d(v_i, n(m+1)) = k)$, we limit ourselves to estimate its order of magnitude:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(Y_{v_i}^n = y \mid d(v_i, n(m+1)) = k) &= \binom{m}{y} \left[1 - O\left(\frac{1}{n}\right)\right]^{m-y} O\left(\frac{1}{n^y}\right) \\ &= \binom{m}{y} O\left(\frac{1}{n^y}\right) \sum_{\ell=0}^{m-y} \binom{m-y}{\ell} (-1)^\ell O\left(\frac{1}{n^\ell}\right) \\ &= O\left(\frac{1}{n^y}\right), \quad 2 \leq y \leq m. \end{aligned} \quad (5.7)$$

Then

$$\mathbb{P}(Y_{v_i}^n \geq 2 \mid d(v_i, n(m+1)) = k) = O\left(\frac{1}{n^2}\right) + O\left(\frac{1}{n^3}\right) + \dots + O\left(\frac{1}{n^m}\right) = O\left(\frac{1}{n^2}\right). \quad (5.8)$$

Finally, by (5.5), (5.6) and (5.8) we obtain that $\mathbb{P}(Y_{v_i}^n = 1)$ is at most

$$1 - \left[1 - \frac{mk}{2mn+1} + O\left(\frac{1}{n^2}\right)\right] - O\left(\frac{1}{n^2}\right) < \frac{k}{2n} + O\left(\frac{1}{n^2}\right) \quad (5.9)$$

and at least

$$1 - \left[1 - \frac{mk}{2m(n+1)-1} + O\left(\frac{1}{n^2}\right)\right] - O\left(\frac{1}{n^2}\right) > \frac{k}{2(n+1)} + O\left(\frac{1}{n^2}\right). \quad (5.10)$$

Therefore there exist $b_1 > b_2 > 0$ such that (5.8) gives (5.2), and $c_2, c_1 > 0$ such that (5.9) and (5.10) give (5.1).

To determine (5.3), let $X_{v_{n+1}}^n$ be number of incoming edges from v_{n+1} to itself during the time interval $(n(m+1), (n+1)(m+1)]$. Note that during this period $X_{v_{n+1}}^n$ can be at most equal to m , since at time $n(m+1) + 1$ no edge is added. Thus, by (2.1), the order of magnitude of the probability of no loops for v_{n+1} during such time interval is given by

$$\mathbb{P}(X_{v_{n+1}}^n = 0) = \prod_{i=2}^{m+1} \left(1 - \frac{1}{2(mn+i-1)-1}\right) = [1 - O(1/n)]^m = 1 - O(1/n), \quad (5.11)$$

or equivalently

$$\mathbb{P}[d(v_{n+1}, (n+1)(m+1)) = m] = 1 - O(1/n). \quad (5.12)$$

□

Now we consider for each $i \geq 1$ the degree process $\{d(v_i, n(m+1))\}_{n \geq i}$, indexed by n . For any fixed $n \geq i$, $d(v_i, n(m+1))$ satisfies (5.1), (5.2) and (5.3). For $n \geq i$ let $E = \{m, m+1, \dots\}$ be the state space of $d(v_i, n(m+1))$ and let $\mathcal{M}(E)$ be the class of probability measures on the space E endowed with the σ -algebra $\mathcal{F}$ of all subsets of E . The degree process $\{d(v_i, n(m+1))\}_{n \geq i}$ is defined on the product space $(E^\infty, \mathcal{F}^\infty) = (\times_{n=i}^\infty E_n, \otimes_{n=i}^\infty \mathcal{F}_n)$, where $(E_n, \mathcal{F}_n)$, $n \geq i$ are copies of $(E, \mathcal{F})$. The process from time i to time $i+h$ is defined on the product space $(E^{i+h}, \mathcal{F}^{i+h}) = (\times_{n=i}^{i+h} E_n, \otimes_{n=i}^{i+h} \mathcal{F}_n)$. The elements of these spaces will be denoted by $x^{i+h} = (x_i, x_{i+1}, \dots, x_{i+h})$ and $x^\infty = (x_i, x_{i+1}, \dots)$, respectively. Note that we have $x^{i+h} \leq y^{i+h}$ if and only if $x_{i+j} \leq y_{i+j}$ for all $0 \leq j \leq h$.

To prove Theorem 4.1, we proceed through three steps. First we define two Markovian processes, on the same probability space as $\{d(v_i, n(m+1))\}_{n \geq i}$, determined by known Markovian kernels. Then we show that these two processes bound from above and below the

degree process of the BA model. Finally we prove that these two processes converge to a unique process as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

As far as the first step is concerned we define p_{n+1} be a positive function on $E^n \times E_{n+1}$, measurable with respect to $\mathcal{F}^n \otimes \mathcal{F}_{n+1}$, and given by

$$p_{n+1}(x^n, x_{n+1}) = p_{n+1}(x_n, x_n + \ell) = \begin{cases} \frac{x_n}{2(n+1)} + \frac{c_2}{n^2}, & \text{if } \ell = 1, \\ \frac{b_2}{n^2}, & \text{if } \ell = 2, \\ 1 - \frac{x_n}{2(n+1)} - \frac{b_2+c_2}{n^2}, & \text{if } \ell = 0. \end{cases} \quad (5.13)$$

Then we define the following Markov transition kernel K_{n+1} from $E^n \times \mathcal{F}_{n+1}$ into $[0, 1]$:

$$K_{n+1}(x^n, B) = \sum_{x_{n+1} \in B} p_{n+1}(x^n, x_{n+1}), \quad x^n \in E^n, B \in \mathcal{F}_{n+1}. \quad (5.14)$$

The mapping $x^n \rightarrow K_{n+1}(x^n, B)$ is $\mathcal{F}^n$ -measurable for every set B in $\mathcal{F}_{n+1}$, while $B \rightarrow K_{n+1}(x^n, B)$ is a measure P_{n+1} on $\mathcal{M}(E_{n+1})$ for every $x^n \in E^n$. In an analogous way we define the function

$$r_{n+1}(z^n, z_{n+1}) = r_{n+1}(z_n, z_n + \ell) = \begin{cases} \frac{z_n}{2n} + \frac{c_1}{n^2}, & \text{if } \ell = 1, \\ \frac{b_2}{n^2}, & \text{if } \ell = m, \\ 1 - \frac{z_n}{2n} - \frac{b_1+c_1}{n^2}, & \text{if } \ell = 0, \end{cases} \quad (5.15)$$

that we associate to the Markov transition kernel $\tilde{K}_{n+1}$, where $B \rightarrow \tilde{K}_{n+1}(z^n, B)$, is a measure R_{n+1} on $\mathcal{M}(E_{n+1})$ for every $z^n \in E^n$. Furthermore, a function $q_{n+1}(y^n, y_{n+1}) = q_{n+1}(y_n, y_n + \ell)$ such that

- $p_{n+1}(y_n, y_n + 1) < q_{n+1}(y_n, y_n + 1) < r_{n+1}(y_n, y_n + 1)$,
- $p_{n+1}(y_n, y_n + 2) < q_{n+1}(y_n, y_n + \ell) < r_{n+1}(y_n, y_n + m)$, for $\ell = 2, \dots, m$,
- $q_{n+1}(y_n, y_n) = 1 - \sum_{\ell=1}^m q_{n+1}(y_n, y_n + \ell)$,

can be associated to another Markov transition kernel K_{n+1}^* in the same way as K_{n+1} and $\tilde{K}_{n+1}$, where $B \rightarrow K_{n+1}^*(y^n, B)$ is a measure Q_{n+1} on $\mathcal{M}(E_{n+1})$ for every $y^n \in E^n$.

In order to prove that there exist two processes that bound from above and below the degree process of the BA model we have first to prove a similar result for random variables. This goal is attained through the following

Lemma 5.2. *Let X_i, Y_i , and Z_i , $i \geq 1$, be random variables on E_i with distributions P_i, Q_i and R_i , respectively, and satisfying $\mathbb{P}(X_i = Y_i = Z_i) = 1$. Then there exist random variables X_{n+1}, Y_{n+1} , and Z_{n+1} , $n \geq i$, taking values in E_{n+1} , such that the conditional distributions of X_{n+1} given $X_n = x_n$, Y_{n+1} given $Y_n = y_n$, and Z_{n+1} given $Z_n = z_n$ are exactly $p_{n+1}(x_n, \cdot)$, $q_{n+1}(y_n, \cdot)$, and $r_{n+1}(z_n, \cdot)$, respectively. Moreover*

$$\mathbb{P}(X_n \leq Y_n \leq Z_n) = 1, \quad n \geq i. \quad (5.16)$$

Proof. Let us construct three E_{n+1} -valued random variables, X_{n+1}, Y_{n+1} , and Z_{n+1} , such that $X_{n+1} \leq Y_{n+1} \leq Z_{n+1}$ almost surely, and with conditional distributions $p_{n+1}(x_n, \cdot)$, $q_{n+1}(y_n, \cdot)$ and $r_{n+1}(z_n, \cdot)$, respectively. For this aim we make use of a free coupling process (see [16], Chapter 3). For each x_n, y_n , and z_n in E_n , $n \geq i$ we construct the partitions of the closed interval $[0, 1]$: $(I_{x_n}(j))_{j=0,1,2}$, $(I_{y_n}(j))_{j=0}^m$, and $(I_{z_n}(j))_{j=0,1,m}$, respectively. The elements of I_{y_n} are given by

$$\begin{aligned} I_{y_n}(0) &= [0, q_{n+1}(y_n, y_n)), \\ &\dots \\ I_{y_n}(j) &= \left[\sum_{w=0}^{j-1} q_{n+1}(y_n, y_n + w), \sum_{w=0}^j q_{n+1}(y_n, y_n + w) \right), \\ &\dots \\ I_{y_n}(m) &= \left[\sum_{w=0}^{m-1} q_{n+1}(y_n, y_n + w), 1 \right). \end{aligned}$$

The other two partitions for x_n and z_n are defined in an analogous way. We explicitly note that

$$\begin{aligned} |I_{x_n}(j)| &= p_{n+1}(x_n, x_n + j), & j &= 0, 1, 2, \\ |I_{y_n}(j)| &= q_{n+1}(y_n, y_n + j), & j &= 0, \dots, m, \\ |I_{z_n}(j)| &= r_{n+1}(z_n, z_n + j), & j &= 0, 1, m, \end{aligned}$$

where $|I|$ denotes the length of the set I . Let now $\{U_n\}_{n \geq i}$ be a sequence of uniform random variables in $[0, 1]$. For each $n \geq i$, define $X_{n+1} = H_1(X_n; U_n)$, $Y_{n+1} = H_2(Y_n; U_n)$, $Z_{n+1} = H_3(Z_n; U_n)$, where

$$H_1(x_n; u) = \sum_{j=0}^2 (x_n + j) \mathbb{I}_{\{u \in I_{x_n}(j)\}},$$

and H_2 and H_3 are defined in the same way with x replaced by y and z , respectively.

Note that

$$\begin{aligned} p_{n+1}(x_n, x_n + j_x) &= \mathbb{P}[H_1(x_n; U_n) = x_n + j_x], \\ q_{n+1}(y_n, y_n + j_y) &= \mathbb{P}[H_2(y_n; U_n) = y_n + j_y], \\ r_{n+1}(z_n, z_n + j_z) &= \mathbb{P}[H_3(z_n; U_n) = z_n + j_z], \end{aligned}$$

if and only if $U_n \in I_{x_n}(j_x) \cap I_{y_n}(j_y) \cap I_{z_n}(j_z)$.

To show that (5.16) holds we recall that $X_i = Y_i = Z_i$ almost surely. Consequently, applying H_l , $l = 1, 2, 3$, to a common sequence of random variables $\{U_n\}_{n \geq i}$, we obtain that

$$H_1(X_n; U_n) \leq H_2(Y_n; U_n) \leq H_3(Z_n; U_n) \quad \text{a.s.},$$

that is to say $X_{n+1} \leq Y_{n+1} \leq Z_{n+1}$ almost surely. $\square$

Let us consider the process $\{d(v_i, n(m+1))\}_{n \geq i}$ and its probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, \mathbb{P})$. On the same probability space let us define two Markov processes $\{d^1(v_i, n(m+1))\}_{n \geq i}$ and $\{d^2(v_i, n(m+1))\}_{n \geq i}$, $i > 1$, with their initial states such that $\mathbb{P}(d^1(v_i, i(m+1)) = d(v_i, i(m+1))) = d^2(v_i, i(m+1)) = 1$, and transition probabilities given by (5.15) and (5.13), respectively.

Corollary 5.1. *There exist versions $\{\tilde{d}^1(v_i, n(m+1))\}_{n \geq i}$, $\{\tilde{d}^2(v_i, n(m+1))\}_{n \geq i}$, $\{\tilde{d}(v_i, n(m+1))\}_{n \geq i}$ of the processes $\{d^1(v_i, n(m+1))\}_{n \geq i}$, $\{d^2(v_i, n(m+1))\}_{n \geq i}$ and $\{d(v_i, n(m+1))\}_{n \geq i}$, respectively, such that*

$$\mathbb{P}[\tilde{d}^2(v_i, n(m+1)) \leq \tilde{d}(v_i, n(m+1)) \leq \tilde{d}^1(v_i, n(m+1))] = 1, \quad (5.17)$$

for all $n \geq i$.

Proof. It immediately follows by applying Lemma 5.2 to the processes $\{d^1(v_i, n(m+1))\}_{n \geq i}$, $\{d^2(v_i, n(m+1))\}_{n \geq i}$, and $\{d(v_i, n(m+1))\}_{n \geq i}$. $\square$

Lemma 5.3. *Let $\{\tilde{d}(v_i, n(m+1))\}_{n \geq i}$, $i > 1$, be the process of Corollary 5.1. Let $w_1 < w_2 < \dots < w_b \in \mathbb{R}^+$, $b \geq 1$. Consider the instants $\{x_\ell\}_{\ell=1}^b$, $x_\ell = \lfloor (i-1)w_\ell \rfloor$, and $\{y_\ell\}_{\ell=1}^b$, $y_\ell = \lfloor iw_\ell \rfloor$. Then there exist $\{z_\ell\}_{\ell=1}^b$, $x_\ell < z_\ell \leq y_\ell$, $\ell = 1, \dots, b$, such that the random vector $(\tilde{d}(v_i, (i+z_1)(m+1)), \dots, \tilde{d}(v_i, (i+z_b)(m+1)))$ converges in distribution to $(N_{1/2}^m(\ln(1+w_1)), \dots, N_{1/2}^m(\ln(1+w_b)))$ as $i \rightarrow \infty$. Here $N_{1/2}^m(T)$, $T \geq 0$, is the number of individuals in a Yule process with parameter $1/2$ and m initial individuals.*

Proof. In order to prove the convergence we make use of the processes $\{\tilde{d}^1(v_i, n(m+1))\}_{n \geq i}$ and $\{\tilde{d}^2(v_i, n(m+1))\}_{n \geq i}$ and of their behaviour as i diverges. We focus on the process $\{\tilde{d}^1(v_i, n(m+1))\}_{n \geq i}$, the case of $\{\tilde{d}^2(v_i, n(m+1))\}_{n \geq i}$ can be treated in an analogous way.

To pursue our aim we first fix an initial time, $T = 0$, the instant at which for the first time there are exactly i vertices in the BA model, that is at time $t = i(m+1)$. Then we




Figure 1: The first line represents the time axis of the BA model. The second line shows the number of complete vertices in the BA model. The third and fourth lines correspond to the partitions of $(0, T_2]$ and $(0, T_i]$, respectively.

introduce the times $T_i = \sum_{n=i}^{i+x-1} 1/n$, $x \geq 1$, $i > 1$, together with the interval $(0, T_i]$ and with the partition

$$(0, T_i] = \begin{cases} \left(0, \frac{1}{i}\right], & \text{if } x = 1 \\ \left(0, \frac{1}{i}\right] \cup \bigcup_{j=0}^{x-2} \left(\sum_{n=i}^{i+j} \frac{1}{n}, \sum_{n=i}^{i+j+1} \frac{1}{n}\right], & \text{if } x \geq 2. \end{cases} \quad (5.18)$$

Note that the intervals of this partition have lengths $h_n = 1/n$, $n = i, i+1, \dots, i+x-1$, and are disjoint. Then we number the intervals of (5.18) with an increasing index ℓ , $\ell = 1, 2, \dots, x$. See Figure 5.1.

Let us introduce the point process $\mathfrak{N}^1(T_i)$, jumping at times $T_i \geq 0$, starting with an initial random number of individuals with distribution only asymptotically degenerate on m , i.e. $\mathbb{P}(\mathfrak{N}^1(0) \neq m) = O(1/i)$, and characterized by the appearance of a new individual generated by the existing ones at the time instants $1/i$ and $\sum_{n=i}^{i+j+1} 1/n$, $j = 0, 1, \dots, x-1$. Note that these instants coincide with the right ends of each interval of the partition. Assume that the transition probabilities of this point process coincide with (5.15) for $n = (i+j)$, $j = 0, 1, \dots, x-1$. Hence we can write

$$\mathbb{P}[\mathfrak{N}^1(T_i + h_n) = k + \ell \mid \mathfrak{N}^1(T_i) = k] = \begin{cases} \frac{k}{2} h_n + o(h_n), & \text{if } \ell = 1, \\ o(h_n), & \text{if } \ell = m, \\ 1 - \frac{k}{2} h_n + o(h_n), & \text{if } \ell = 0. \end{cases} \quad (5.19)$$

Observe that the sample paths of $\{\mathfrak{N}^1(T_i)\}_{T_i \geq 0}$ as those of $\{\tilde{d}^1(v_i, n(m+1))\}_{n \geq i}$ are non-decreasing right continuous and integer valued step functions. However the lengths of the steps in $\{\tilde{d}^1(v_i, n(m+1))\}_{n \geq i}$ always equal unity, while those of $\{\mathfrak{N}^1(T_i)\}_{T_i \geq 0}$ assume the rational values h_n . Choosing $x = \lfloor (i-1)w \rfloor$, $w \in \mathbb{R}^+$ and using the well-known relation $\sum_{n=1}^M 1/n = \ln(M) + \gamma + O(1/M)$, where γ is the Euler–Mascheroni constant, we have that

$$T_i = \ln \left(1 + \frac{\lfloor (i-1)w \rfloor}{(i-1)} \right) + O(1/i) \rightarrow \ln(1+w),$$

as $i \rightarrow \infty$.

In a perfectly analogous way we introduce the times $\mathcal{T}_i = \sum_{n=i}^{i+y-1} 1/(n+1)$ together with a point process $\{\mathfrak{N}^2(\mathcal{T}_i)\}_{\mathcal{T}_i \geq 0}$, to study the process $\{\tilde{d}^2(v_i, n(m+1))\}_{n \geq i}$. Here we divide $(0, \mathcal{T}_i]$ into y disjoint subintervals of lengths $h_n^* = 1/(n+1)$, $n = i, i+1, \dots, i+y-1$. We assume this

process starts with an initial random number of individuals such that $\mathbb{P}(\mathfrak{N}^2(0) \neq m) = O(1/i)$ and its transition probabilities coincide with (5.13) for $n = (i + j)$, $j = 0, 1, \dots, y - 1$. Thus,

$$\mathbb{P}[\mathfrak{N}^2(\mathcal{T}_i + h_n^*) = k + \ell \mid \mathfrak{N}^2(\mathcal{T}_i) = k] = \begin{cases} \frac{k}{2} h_n^* + o(h_n^*), & \ell = 1, \\ o(h_n^*), & \ell = 2, \\ 1 - \frac{k}{2} h_n^* + o(h_n^*), & \ell = 0. \end{cases} \quad (5.20)$$

Thus, choosing $y = \lfloor iw \rfloor$, $w \in \mathbb{R}^+$ we get that

$$\mathcal{T}_i = \ln \left(1 + \frac{\lfloor iw \rfloor}{i} \right) + O(1/i) \rightarrow \ln(1 + w),$$

as $i \rightarrow \infty$.

Note that $\mathfrak{N}^1(\mathcal{T}_i)$ and $\mathfrak{N}^2(\mathcal{T}_i)$ have the same law as $\tilde{d}^1(v_i, (i + x - 1)(m + 1))$ and $\tilde{d}^2(v_i, (i + y - 1)(m + 1))$, respectively. Moreover, as $i \rightarrow \infty$, h_n and h_n^* decrease to zero as infinitesimals of the same order. In this case we explicitly underline that both $\mathcal{T}_i$ and $\mathcal{T}_i$ converge to the same continuous-time $T = \ln(1 + w)$ and (5.19) and (5.20) can be read as the infinitesimal transition probabilities of a pure birth process (see (2.2)) with intensity $1/2$ and starting with m individuals because $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(\mathfrak{N}^1(0) = m) = \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(\mathfrak{N}^2(0) = m) = 1$.

Therefore, since the transition probabilities and the initial condition determine uniquely the finite-dimensional distributions of a Markovian process, we have

$$\mathfrak{N}^1(\mathcal{T}_i) \rightarrow N_{1/2}^m(\ln(1 + w)),$$

$$\mathfrak{N}^2(\mathcal{T}_i) \rightarrow N_{1/2}^m(\ln(1 + w)),$$

in distribution, as $i \rightarrow \infty$, where $N_{1/2}^m(T)$ is the number of individuals of a Yule process with initial population size equal to m . Consequently, we have

$$\tilde{d}^1(v_i, (i + x - 1)(m + 1)) \rightarrow N_{1/2}^m(\ln(1 + w)), \quad (5.21)$$

$$\tilde{d}^2(v_i, (i + y - 1)(m + 1)) \rightarrow N_{1/2}^m(\ln(1 + w)), \quad (5.22)$$

in distribution, as $i \rightarrow \infty$.

Observe that at time $n(m + 1)$, $n \geq i$, by (5.17) the random variables $\tilde{d}^1(v_i, n(m + 1))$, $\tilde{d}^2(v_i, n(m + 1))$ and $\tilde{d}^2(v_i, n(m + 1))$ are almost surely ordered. Due to the non decreasing property of the trajectories, then there exist values $x < z \leq y$ such that

$$\tilde{d}^1(v_i, (i + x - 1)(m + 1)) = \tilde{d}(v_i, (i + z - 1)(m + 1)) = \tilde{d}^2(v_i, (i + y - 1)(m + 1)) \quad \text{a.s.} \quad (5.23)$$

From (5.21), (5.22), and (5.23) we obtain the convergence of the random variable $\tilde{d}(v_i, (i + z - 1)(m + 1))$, i.e.

$$\tilde{d}(v_i, (i + z - 1)(m + 1)) \rightarrow N_{1/2}^m(\ln(1 + w)), \quad (5.24)$$

in distribution, as $i \rightarrow \infty$.

Finally, by the Markov property of the process $\{\tilde{d}(v_i, n(m + 1))\}_{n \geq i}$ and of the Yule process, we extend the convergence to the b -finite-dimensional distributions, for all $b \geq 1$. Formally, let $x_1 = \lfloor (i - 1)w_1 \rfloor, \dots, x_b = \lfloor (i - 1)w_b \rfloor$, $y_1 = \lfloor iw_1 \rfloor, \dots, y_b = \lfloor iw_b \rfloor$, $w_1 < w_2 < \dots < w_b \in \mathbb{R}^+$, and take $z_1, \dots, z_b$ such that $x_1 < z_1 \leq y_1, \dots, x_b < z_b \leq y_b$ and satisfy (5.23). Denote the event $\{\tilde{d}(v_i, (i + z_j - 1)(m + 1)) = k_j\}$ by A_j . Then,

$$\mathbb{P}(A_1, \dots, A_b) \rightarrow \mathbb{P}[N_{1/2}^m(\ln(1 + w_1)) = k_1, \dots, N_{1/2}^m(\ln(1 + w_b)) = k_b],$$

as $i \rightarrow \infty$. □

Proof of Theorem 4.1. Using Lemma 5.1, Corollary 5.1 and Lemma 5.3 we obtain the convergence of the marginals. To get the joint convergence we make use of the independence of the increments and of the distribution of the number of individuals in a Yule process with m initial progenitors (see [15], Section XVII.3). □

5.2 A Lemma and the Proof of Theorem 4.2

In this section we make use of the planted model described in Section 3. Remember that the BA random graph model corresponds to the case in which all the random variables M_n , $n \geq 1$, are concentrated on m , so that $\mathfrak{T}_n = n(m+1)$ almost surely.

Formally, let $(G_m^t)_{t \geq 1}$ be the random graph process defining the BA model as in subsection 2.1. For each $1 \leq j \leq i$ consider the birth processes in discrete time $\{b(v_j, n(m+1))\}_{n \geq i}$, with state space given by $\mathbb{N}$ and determined by the transition probabilities

$$\mathbb{P}[b(v_j, (n+1)(m+1)) = k + \ell \mid b(v_j, n(m+1)) = k] = \begin{cases} \frac{k}{n}, & \ell = 1, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (5.25)$$

and initial condition $b(v_j, i(m+1)) = 1$ almost surely.

Lemma 5.4. *Let $x_1 = \lfloor (i-1)w_1 \rfloor, \dots, x_b = \lfloor (i-1)w_b \rfloor$, $w_1 < w_2 < \dots < w_b \in \mathbb{R}^+$. We have*

$$(b(v_j, (i+x_1)(m+1)), \dots, b(v_j, (i+x_b)(m+1))) \rightarrow (N_1^1(\ln(1+w_1)), \dots, N_1^1(\ln(1+w_b))) \quad (5.26)$$

in distribution as $i \rightarrow \infty$, where $N_1^1(T)$ is the number of individuals of a Yule process with one initial individual and parameter 1.

Proof. For each $1 \leq j \leq i$, we consider a convergence to a continuous-time process in the same way as we did in the proof of Lemma 5.3 for $\mathfrak{N}^1(T_i)$, but considering that $\mathfrak{N}^1(0) = 1$, i.e., the process starts with only one individual, and transition probabilities given by (5.25). Thus, as $i \rightarrow \infty$, the probabilities (5.25) become the infinitesimal transition probabilities of a Yule process with intensity 1 starting with one individual. Since the process is Markovian the transition probabilities and the initial condition determine uniquely the finite-dimensional distributions. $\square$

Proof of Theorem 4.2. Consider the planted model in which the number of planted vertices i depends on n (i.e. $i := i(n)$) and is such that $i(n) \rightarrow \infty$ but $i(n)/n \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Then the probability that at time $t = n(m+1)$, $n \geq i$, the random vertex V_t chosen uniformly at random, is one of the first i vertices goes to zero as $n \rightarrow \infty$, i.e., $\mathbb{P}(V_t \in \{v_1, v_2, \dots, v_i\}) = i/n = o(1)$. Moreover, conditioning on this event we obtain

$$\mathbb{P}(d(V_t) = k) = \mathbb{P}(d(V_t) = k \mid V_t \notin \{v_1, v_2, \dots, v_i\}) + o(1). \quad (5.27)$$

Recall that in the planted model we have i discrete-time birth processes $\{b(v_j, n(m+1))\}_{n \geq i}$, $1 \leq j \leq i$. Furthermore, by Theorem 3.1, the event of choosing a vertex uniformly at random in the BA model is equivalent to that of selecting first uniformly at random one of the i processes $\{b(v_j, n(m+1))\}_{n \geq i}$, $1 \leq j \leq i$, and then choosing uniformly at random a vertex belonging to it. Take now any of these birth processes, say $\{b(v_1, n(m+1))\}_{n \geq 1}$. As $i \rightarrow \infty$, by Lemma 5.4 we have that $\{b(v_1, n(m+1))\}_{n \geq 1}$ converges in distribution to a Yule process with intensity 1 and starting with one initial individual. Furthermore, by Corollary 5.1 and Lemma 5.3, the degree of a vertex belonging to $\{b(v_1, n(m+1))\}_{n \geq 1}$, $v \neq v_1$, converges in distribution to the size of a Yule process with intensity $1/2$ and m initial individuals. Since these Yule processes describe an m -Yule model with parameter $\lambda = 1/2$ and $\beta = 1$, then by (5.27),

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(d(V_t) = k) = \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{N}_T^m = k). \quad (5.28)$$

To prove (4.4) note that

$$\mathbb{E}\left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{I}_{\{d(v_i, t) = k\}}\right) = \frac{\mathbb{E}N_{k,t}}{n} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{P}(d(v_i, t) = k) = \mathbb{P}(d(V_t) = k).$$

Let $\mathcal{F}_t$ be the natural filtration generated by the process $\{N_{k,t}\}_{t \geq 1}$ up to time t , and define $Z_s = \mathbb{E}(N_{k,t} \mid \mathcal{F}_s)$. Observe that Z_s is a martingale as $\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}(N_{k,t} \mid \mathcal{F}_s) \mid \mathcal{F}_r] = \mathbb{E}(N_{k,t} \mid \mathcal{F}_r)$, for $r \leq s \leq t$. Considering that at each time interval $(s-1, s]$ a new vertex v_s appears and m directed edges from it are attached to existing vertices, then v_s is attached to at most m different vertices, say $v^1, \dots, v^m$. This does not affect the degree of the other existing vertices

$w \neq v^1, \dots, v^m$, neither the attachment probabilities related to them. Thus, it follows that $|Z_s - Z_{s-1}| \leq 2m$. Since $Z_t = N_{k,t}$ and $Z_0 = \mathbb{E}N_{k,t}$, then by taking $x = \sqrt{t \ln t}$ and applying the Azuma–Hoeffding inequality (see Lemma 4.2.3 in [13]), we obtain

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\left|\frac{N_{k,t}}{n} - \frac{\mathbb{E}N_{k,t}}{n}\right| > \sqrt{\frac{(m+1)\ln(n(m+1))}{n}}\right) \leq (n(m+1))^{-1/8},$$

and hence, as $n \rightarrow \infty$ we get the desired result. $\square$

5.3 Proof of Proposition 4.1

Proof. Let us consider an m -Yule model $\{Y_{1/2,1}^m(T)\}_{T \geq 0}$. It is known that by conditioning on the number of genera present at time T , the random times at which novel genera appear are distributed as the order statistics of i.i.d. random variables distributed with distribution function given by (see e.g. [20] and the references therein)

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{T} \leq \tau) = \frac{e^\tau - 1}{e^T - 1}, \quad 0 \leq \tau \leq T. \quad (5.29)$$

Let us now define $\mathcal{N}_T^m$ to be the size of a genus chosen uniformly at random at time T . Then, for any $k \geq m$ and recalling the distribution of a Yule process starting with m initial individuals,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{N}_T^m = k) &= \int_0^T \mathbb{P}(N_{1/2}^m(T) = k \mid N_{1/2}^m(\tau) = m) \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{T} \in d\tau) \\ &= \int_0^T \binom{k-1}{m-1} e^{-m \frac{T-\tau}{2}} (1 - e^{-\frac{T-\tau}{2}})^{k-m} \frac{e^\tau}{e^T - 1} d\tau \\ &= \frac{1}{1 - e^{-T}} \int_0^T \binom{k-1}{m-1} e^{-y} e^{-m \frac{y}{2}} (1 - e^{-\frac{y}{2}})^{k-m} dy. \end{aligned} \quad (5.30)$$

By letting $z = 1 - e^{-\frac{y}{2}}$, we can write (5.30) as

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{N}_T^m = k) = \frac{2}{1 - e^{-T}} \int_0^{1 - e^{-\frac{T}{2}}} \binom{k-1}{m-1} z^{k-m} (1 - z)^{m+1} dz. \quad (5.31)$$

Our interest is in the asymptotic behaviour when $T \rightarrow \infty$. In this case (5.31) reduces to

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{N}_T^m = k) &= 2 \binom{k-1}{m-1} B(k - m + 1, m + 2) \\ &= m(m+1)B(k, 3), \end{aligned} \quad (5.32)$$

where $B(a, b)$ denotes the Beta function. $\square$

References

- [1] A. Barabási and R. Albert. Emergence of scaling in random networks. *Science*, 286(5439):509–512, 1999.
- [2] N. Berger, C. Borgs, J. T. Chayes, and A. Saberi. Asymptotic behavior and distributional limits of preferential attachment graphs. *Ann. Probab.*, 42(1):1–40, 2014.
- [3] B. Bollobás and O. Riordan. The diameter of a scale-free random graph. *Combinatorica*, 24(1):5–34, 2004.
- [4] B. Bollobás, O. Riordan, J. Spencer, and G. Tusnády. The Degree Sequence of a Scale-free Random Graph Process. *Random Struct. Algorithms*, 18(3):279–290, 2001.
- [5] A. Clauset, C. R. Shalizi, and M. E. J. Newman. Power-Law Distributions in Empirical Data. *SIAM Review*, 51(4):661–703, 2009.
- [6] N. Cohen, J. Jordan, and M. Voliotis. Preferential duplication graphs. *J. Appl. Probab.*, 47(2):572–585, 2010.

- [7] C. Cooper and A. Frieze. A General Model of Web Graphs. *Random Struct. Algorithms*, 22(3):311–335, 2003.
- [8] D. J. de Solla Price. Networks of scientific papers. *Science*, 149:510–515, 1965.
- [9] D. J. de Solla Price. A general theory of bibliometric and other cumulative advantage processes. *J. Amer. Soc. Inform. Sci.*, 27:292–306, 1976.
- [10] M. Deijfen, H. van den Esker, R. van der Hofstad, and G. Hooghiemst. A preferential attachment model with random initial degrees. *Ark. Mat*, 47(1):41–72, 2009.
- [11] S. Dereich and M. Ortgiere. Robust analysis of preferential attachment models with fitness. *Combinatorics, Probability and Computing*, 23:386–411, 2014.
- [12] S. N. Dorogovtsev, J. F. F. Mendes, and A. N. Samukhin. Structure of Growing Networks with Preferential Linking. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 85:4633–4636, 2000.
- [13] R. Durrett. *Random Graph Dynamics*. Cambridge University Press, New York, NY, USA, 2006.
- [14] M. Faloutsos, P. Faloutsos, and C. Faloutsos. On power-law relationships of the internet topology. *SIGCOMM Comput. Commun. Rev.*, 29(4):251–262, 1999.
- [15] W. Feller. *An Introduction to Probability Theory and its Applications*, volume 1. Wiley, third edition, 1968.
- [16] A. Ferrari and A. Galves. *Construction of Stochastic Processes, Coupling and Regeneration*. Available from <http://people.ufpr.br/~lucambio/CE222/2S2011/oct2001.pdf>, 2001.
- [17] N. Johnson and S. Kotz. *Urn Models and Their Application: An Approach to Modern Discrete Probability Theory*. John Wiley & Sons Inc, New York, NY, USA, 1977.
- [18] A. Klaus, S. Yu, and D. Plenz. Statistical Analyses Support Power Law Distributions Found in Neuronal Avalanches. *PLoS ONE*, 6:19779, May 2011.
- [19] J. Kleinberg, R. Kumar, P. Raghavan, S. Rajagopalan, and A. S. Tomkins. The web as a graph: Measurements, models, and methods. In *Proceedings of the 5th Annual International Conference on Computing and Combinatorics, COCOON’99*, pages 1–17, Berlin, Heidelberg, 1999. Springer-Verlag.
- [20] P. Lansky, F. Polito, and L. Sacerdote. The role of detachment of in-links in scale-free networks. *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical*, 47(34):345002, 2014.
- [21] M. E. J. Newman. The structure and function of complex networks. *SIAM REVIEW*, 45:167–256, 2003.
- [22] L. Ostroumova, A. Ryabchenko, and E. Samosvat. Generalized preferential attachment: tunable power-law degree distribution and clustering coefficient. In *Algorithms and models for the web graph*, volume 8305 of *Lecture Notes in Comput. Sci.*, pages 185–202. Springer, 2013.
- [23] A. Pachon, F. Polito, and L. Sacerdote. Random graphs associated to some discrete and continuous time preferential attachment models. *Journal of Statistical Physics*, 162(6):1608–1638, 2016.
- [24] M. V. Simkin and V. P. Roychowdhury. Re-inventing Willis. *Physics Reports*, 502(1):1–35, 2011.
- [25] H. A. Simon. On a class of skew distribution functions. *Biometrika*, 42(3–4):425–440, 1955.
- [26] G. U. Yule. A Mathematical Theory of Evolution, Based on the Conclusions of Dr. J. C. Willis, F.R.S. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London B: Biological Sciences*, 213(402-410):21–87, 1925.